



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,553	07/13/2005	Rahul R. Uplap	CECO-91	3257
54620 7590 04/11/2008 KRIEG DEVAULT LLP ONE INDIANA SQUARE SUITE 2800 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2079			EXAMINER GONZALEZ, JULIO C	
			ART UNIT 2834	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,553

Applicant(s)

UPLAP ET AL

Examiner

Julio C. Gonzalez

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7 and 21-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 25-34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atago et al (US 4,593,663) in view of Peterson, Jr. (US 3,960,130) and Kuroda et al (US 6,504,259).

Atago et al discloses providing an amount of fuel to a combustion engine taking into consideration the engine's temperature and speed (column 6, lines 37 – 48, 59 – 65) and also the acceleration is controlled based on temperature and speed (column 10, lines 32 – 44; column 12, lines 18 – 24).

However, Atago et al does not disclose taking into consideration controlling the engine at a target time.

On the other hand, Peterson discloses for the purpose of minimizing damage to engines that engine's acceleration can be controlled using the engine's temperature and speed (column 6, lines 3 – 13) and at a target time (column 4, lines 24 – 26 & notice graph in figure 1).

Kuroda et al is being cited for the purpose of improving drivability in vehicles that it is well known in the art to drive an electric generator 16 by an engine 10 (see figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control an engine by using the temperature and speed and to control the engine based on a specific time for the purpose of minimizing damage to engines as disclosed by Peterson and to teach that a generator can be driven by an engine for the purpose of improving drivability in vehicles as shown by Kuroda et al.

3. Claims 3, 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atago et al, Peterson and Kuroda et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fujimore et al (US 4,742,462).

The combined control system discloses all of the elements above. However, the combined control system does not disclose that acceleration can be calculated based on a certain speed and time.

On the other hand, Fujimore et al discloses for the purpose of controlling efficiently the operation of combustion engines that the acceleration of an engine

can be calculated by taking into consideration a speed and time (see figures 10, 11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose the combined system as disclosed above and to control the engine acceleration by using a specific speed and time for the purpose of controlling efficiently the operation of combustion engines as disclosed by Fujimore et al.

4. Claims 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atago et al, Peterson and Kuroda et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yomogida (US 2003/0056763).

The combined control system discloses all of the elements above. However, the combined control system does not disclose using a turbo charger.

On the other hand, Yomogida discloses for the purpose of improving the efficiency and suppressing the generation of smoke in engines that it is well known in the art to use turbo chargers (see paragraph 0038, figure 4) and to use injectors (see paragraphs 0017, 0024).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose the combined system as disclosed above and to

use a turbo charger for the purpose of improving the efficiency and suppressing the generation of smoke in engines as disclosed by Yomogida.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Atago et al discloses controlling the acceleration of an engine using the temperature of the engine (column 6, lines 37-43) and using a target speed (column 10, lines 41 – 44; column 10, lines 57 – 63). Moreover, a pulse signal is disclosed (column 6, line 45, 46), thus, inherently a target time is taken into consideration in the controlling of the acceleration. Also, Atago et al discloses controlling (governing) the speed of the engine after reaching a target speed (column 10, lines 41 – 44).

Moreover, Peterson, Jr. discloses more explicitly controlling the acceleration of an engine by reaching a target engine speed at a target time (column 3, lines 43 - 55). See figure 1 of Peterson, Jr.

Fujimore et al discloses teaching using a diesel engine (column 4, lines 29 – 31). Fujimore et al also discloses regulating the fuel (column 2, lines 44 - 50; column

12, lines 1 - 40) and detecting performance of the engine by using engine and acceleration limits (column 9, lines 37 - 47; column 9, lines 51 - 63).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 25 – 34 are allowed.
7. Claims 21, 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will

be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio C. Gonzalez whose telephone number is 571-272-2024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. C. G./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2834

April 10, 2008

/Julio C. Gonzalez/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2834